

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4305

Hoover wanted, even in the Coolidge administration, to lay a heavy hand on the Federal Reserve Board to slow down the speculation which resulted in the big bust.

Yet, after he became President, a well-financed campaign set out, even before the depression, to vilify him as no man had ever been vilified before.

The moral may be that virtue and accomplishment cannot be put down. Mr. Hoover not only outlived the smear; he transcended the smearers.

At 90 he is securely in position as the first American.

A Latin remark goes to the effect that if you want to see the man's monument, look around you. It holds for Mr. Hoover. Much that has remained sane and durably decent in this country owes to him.

Redistribute Immigration Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, revision of our basic immigration laws is a most desirable objective and I am hopeful that the Congress will soon have the opportunity to act on pending proposals to liberalize the quota restrictions.

I note that the administration's proposals in S. 1932 call for the reallocation of unused quotas and the creation of a quota reserve pool to help ease the current immigration restrictions.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, back in 1953 I first introduced legislation to create a pool of unused immigration quotas to enable many Americans to bring close relatives to this country. My proposal differs from some pending proposals in one important respect in that beneficiary countries would repay quotas whenever immigration rates rise in those countries not using all of the quotas authorized by law.

This particular provision would protect nationals behind the Iron Curtain who are being refused exit permits by their governments once freedom is restored to these unhappy lands.

Just recently, I was pleased to present my views on my bill, H.R. 1106, to the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee.

This bill would amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes.

I think it can be readily seen from the title of the bill that it would accomplish very worthwhile objectives without increasing immigration quotas, and that would seem to me to promote desirable reform of our immigration laws. I favor every reasonable proposal to increase quotas and liberalize the law.

As Members of the House so well know, there are some countries in northern Europe where the quotas are now undersubscribed, and some countries in south-

ern Europe where the quotas are heavily oversubscribed in varying degrees.

This situation is all the more difficult because of the fact that some of these quotas are very small to begin with. This is due largely to the way the respective quotas are established under the nationality rule.

It has been suggested that the overall quotas should be raised, that broader exceptions should be written into the law, that all close relatives of American citizens, veterans and legally admitted aliens otherwise qualified, should be admitted. Many proposals have been made to this end and now are pending.

I am sure the Congress always has in mind the practical aspects of immigration legislation and our past experience and difficulties encountered in passing liberalizing legislation in this field. But admittedly, these problems should not deter us as Members of Congress from doing our duty as we see it, to infuse into our immigration laws a more humane spirit that would accommodate them to the needs of a great cosmopolitan country like our own which has welcomed so many immigrants from many lands to our shores, and opened up for them and their dear ones the wide vistas of opportunity that citizens and residents of this great free Nation enjoy.

I may state that I am strongly in favor of organic revision and improvement of the immigration laws by this Nation, although I fully appreciate the very difficult problems that are involved in accomplishing this task.

It would, therefore, seem to me that the proposal contained in my bill being moderate, fair, and reasonable and requiring no massive departure from the policy Congress has followed in the past presents a very attractive, reliable, current method of bringing about desirable reforms in our immigration laws. Such a measure in my opinion could pass the Congress.

I will not go into the various theories, or the philosophy, of immigration laws in general, but I should like to stress this one point, and that is the great, compelling desirability of establishing policies and laws here that would encourage and permit the reuniting of families, thus making it possible for our fellow citizens and residents of this country to bring their dear ones here to join them in larger numbers and more quickly than has been permitted in the past under existing law.

For these reasons, I think that my pending bill has special and very broad appeal. It has been endorsed in principle by President Truman, by President Eisenhower, by President Kennedy, and I understand that President Johnson may also be favorably disposed and sympathetic toward the proposal. It is a sane, practicable approach to a very thorny problem and it has wide support in the Nation.

It seems quite understandable that such a moderate, yet effective, measure to accomplish a result that most Americans want, would meet with strong favor on the part of the American people, and I hope and urge that the Congress will,

at an early date, grapple boldly with the problem involved here, and approve my bill, or one like it, that will enable us to take a step forward from the maze of formalism and technicality and rather complacent attitude and method which the Nation has been pursuing, and enact a law that will in the real sense help many loyal Americans to be reunited with their families from overseas.

This measure would also emphasize our interest in perpetuating and enriching the spiritual doctrines we have embraced throughout our national life of affording a haven and refuge for the oppressed, the persecuted, and the lowly within the boundaries of our Nation.

Such a measure would be cordially received, not only at home, but abroad, where the people of many nations, nationalities, and races are observing us with a critical eye to ascertain whether we really mean what we say when we talk about America being the land of freedom, equality, and opportunity, and a place where people are treated equally under the law, and given the benefit of constitutional safeguards, equal privileges, and entitlements that have meant so much to our Nation and the world.

It is believed by a great many Americans that the national origin system is unfair, unworkable, and discriminatory in its operation. Notwithstanding that fact, if we accept it as many do, it remains that my bill leaves undisturbed the present overall immigration quota totals.

On the other hand, the bill seeks to redistribute some 60,000 or more, unused quota numbers, which are lost each year through lack of applicants in certain countries among countries where long quota waiting lists and heartbreaking delays exist, and where the quotas are generally heavily oversubscribed.

The bill has its proper safeguards in that it would permit the Government over a 5-year period to recapture from any of the affected countries, quota numbers which were redistributed to other nations and which would be lost forever if not used under present immigration laws.

I assert with ample justification, I believe, that my bill would correct certain inequities arising from the act, which provides such small quotas from such countries as Italy and Greece as well as several other countries.

For example, the idea of Italy and Greece, nations from which in a true sense we have drawn so much of our national heritage in terms of freedom, personal liberty, and culture, having less than 6,000 quota numbers is understandably unjustifiable, logically inconsistent, and disruptive of those cordial understandings and sympathetic bonds of approval, friendship, and trust which are necessary to enlightened international policy.

It can be said that not only Italy and Greece, but Lebanon, Turkey, Poland, Lithuania, Israel and some other countries too, have not been accorded proper quotas, considering the quality of loyalty, fidelity, and constructive contributions of the natives of those countries, who

MORI/CDF

A4306

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A

have been outstanding citizens and residents of our own Nation.

We can well take notice of the fact that the operation of our immigration laws has been in many instances harsh, unfair, unsympathetic and arbitrary with regard to the applications of many splendid American citizens who have sought to promote reunion with their relatives in these countries.

Unquestionably the quotas have been discriminatory toward the countries of southern Europe, the Near East, and other nations. It should be noted that northern European countries quota numbers have been undersubscribed at an increasing rate and that the quotas of southern Europe and other parts of the world have been oversubscribed at a very heavy rate.

I should also like to make the point that this condition is bringing disillusionment and resentment to a great many American citizens who feel that their own Government is not treating them fairly in preventing their reunion with their own flesh and blood and close relatives abroad, and I do not believe that this is a healthy or wholesome situation.

My bill offers a ready remedy for the injustices and inequities that have resulted from our basic immigration laws, and since my bill would move in a very substantial way to rectify these conditions, I would be especially grateful to this House for extending the measure the most sympathetic and painstaking consideration, because I believe the measure is definitely in the public interest of our own nation as well as beneficial to our foreign policy, to the morale of our citizens and to a better understanding in the world.

Hon. Albert Carter

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 8, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with our many colleagues in mourning the passing of a former distinguished Member of the House, who I am proud to say was a resident of my congressional district, Albert Carter.

I am sure that none of us will ever forget the helping hands that Al Carter and his wonderful wife extended to so many new Members of Congress when they first arrived in Washington. This can be a most trying and difficult time but Mr. and Mrs. Carter did much to help many of us over the first rough moments of adjustment.

Albert Carter was a dedicated, conscientious Member who compiled a notable record of achievement during his 20 years in the House. I am personally appreciative of his friendship when I was first elected to this great body.

Mrs. Cohelan joins me in extending thanks to the Carters for their thoughtfulness and kindness and in expressing sincere condolences to Mrs. Carter.

Who Is Tampering With the First Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1964

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have said on this floor many times that some of our clergymen are "generals without armies," and I am inserting herewith an article by the Reverend Adolph Bedsole, pastor of the Immanuel Baptist Church in Panama City, Fla.

Pastor Bedsole and many other Baptist ministers have been supporting my efforts and trying their best to get the other Members of Congress to realize the very clergymen in the United States who have received so much publicity in supporting the Supreme Court decisions are but a handful in comparison to the many like Pastor Bedsole who is in favor of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools.

The Reverend Adolph Bedsole is writing a pamphlet on this subject, but in the meantime I am privileged to insert in the RECORD his article "Who Is Tampering With the First Amendment," published recently in the Florida Baptist Witness newspaper, for all to read:

WHO IS TAMPERING WITH THE FIRST AMENDMENT?

(By Adolph Bedsole, pastor, Immanuel Baptist Church, Panama City, Fla.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Despite the expressed opposition of most leaders in major Baptist groups, some Baptists still sincerely favor the Becker amendment. Although we disagree with many of its inclusions, this article is used to present a good composite view of their thinking on the issue.)

"Leave the first amendment alone." This appears to be the text and battle cry of many of our religious leaders in America—including Baptists. Frankly, this is a "lame duck" (not messengers but) message. The ardent opponents of the Becker amendment are now proclaiming what millions of American Christians have been proclaiming for several months; namely, "The first amendment to the Constitution had for 170 years provided us with the separation of church and state which assured the people complete freedom from religious coercion on the part of Government at any level." Why didn't they lift their voice in protest when the Supreme Court used 22 pages of interpretation to tear to shreds the first amendment which our forefathers provided in a few words?

Who first tampered with the first amendment? An atheist, Madalyn Murray and the Supreme Court.

Who is now being accused of trying to destroy the first amendment? Congressmen who have offered 140 proposals to provide Bible reading and prayer in the schools, and those who support them.

Those who are trying to restore and further fortify the first amendment against further inroads of atheists, freethinkers, and Communists are now branded as ill-informed enemies of the first amendment. It just isn't true. Many who advocate Bible reading and prayer in the schools have been diligent in their support of separation of church and state. They have championed religious liberty in our Nation. They have not proposed, or supported the idea that the Gov-

ernment become a teacher of religion. are violently opposed to the Government forcing religion on anybody at any time or place. They insist that participation in Bible reading and prayer remain, as it has for so long, strictly on a voluntary basis.

It may be true that some who favor this amendment would force religion on people if they could. That few might even want to destroy the first amendment. But a vast majority of those favoring this amendment cherish the first amendment; they love religious liberty and they still fight for the separation of church and state. Supporters of the Becker amendment may have some strange bedfellows. The religious opponents of this bill also have some strange bedfellows in atheists, freethinkers, and Communists.

Present day religious opponents of this bill remained strangely silent for a generation of time before the court battles. They were not crusading with Mrs. Murray in her laborious fight to win the "legal" battle. With a resounding victory under her belt and with further plans already well underway to tax the churches, Mrs. Murray and her friends find themselves with some uninvited religious guests who have moved into the picture now to do their part in making her first victory secure. Why?

It is strange indeed to hear that those who are trying to repair the damage done to the first amendment by court tampering are now guilty of tampering.

Has the Supreme Court been misunderstood? Atheists are happy, they seem to understand. The Becker amendment is misunderstood. Its supporters are misunderstood.

The Court decision is not so misunderstood as some think. It is clearly understood that no teacher or other government official is to require, suggest, or promote (force they say) Bible reading (without comment) and prayer in the school as an act of devotion or recognition of God. It is just that simple and it doesn't take a 22-page document to say it. It is clearly understood that the Bible may be read and studied objectively, but not as an act of devotion to the God of the Bible. Thus the Bible has been relegated and depreciated to the level of human books.

But the Becker amendment has been more misunderstood by many. It is not a perfect or divine document. But does America have any document which precludes the possibility of additional problems presenting themselves and demanding a solution in the future? The proposed amendment is short and simple. A careful study of it will clearly reveal the following things:

WHY THIS AMENDMENT SHOULD PASS

1. It would retrieve from atheists, freethinkers and Communists the "legal" victories which they have secured by interpretation.

2. It would prevent further tampering by interpretation with the first amendment by men who were appointed for life and who are never accountable to the people.

3. It would add additional safeguards to religious freedom in America instead of seeking to free America from religion.

4. This amendment does not propose to make the Government a teacher of religion; it proposes to permit the reading of the Bible on a voluntary basis.

5. It does not force prayers on any person; it proposes to permit praying on a voluntary basis.

6. It proposes that America recognize God and ask for His blessings; it does not force God or prayer on any person.

7. Note please. The proposal does not prescribe laws and regulations that it must be done but it prohibits the making of laws, regulations, and interpretations that forbid it.